



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXIII.

APRIL, 1896.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES: THEIR TRUE RELATIONS.

BY DAVID A. WELLS, LL. D.; D. C. L., *Correspondant de l'Institut
de France, etc.*

NOTWITHSTANDING the long-continued and extensive commercial relations between the United States and England (using this term as a synonym for the United Kingdom), far more extensive on the part of the former than with any other nation or people ; notwithstanding that the people of the United States and of England are essentially of the same blood, language, religion and political principles, and that a fair acquaintance with English history and literature is regarded in the United States as an essential to a liberal education ; there are some most important characteristics of England's commercial policy and sovereignty which are not generally recognized in the United States by men claiming to be educated, and by the masses are so completely ignored, as to constitute the occasion for misunderstandings and continual harsh denunciations. If these assumptions are warranted, it would seem almost necessarily to follow that if the true relative conditions of the two countries were better understood, it would be conducive to peace and good feeling, and might be in a high degree influential in respect to a settlement of the Venezuela difficulty.

VOL. CLXII.—NO. 473. 25

Copyright, 1896, by LLOYD BREWSTER. All rights reserved.

That there is much of popular prejudice among the masses in the United States against England cannot be doubted; and the question is most pertinent: To what is such a state of feeling attributable?

A general answer is, to a variety of causes.

First, to the memory of two wars with the mother country. But in each of these contests, the people of the Anglo-American colonies in the first instance, and the people of the United States in the second, obtained all for which they contended; and the parties and the measures responsible for what happened have long passed into history. And here it may not be uninteresting to call attention to the fact, that the grievance of the colonies which is generally regarded as the prime cause of the American Revolution, namely, that the colonists were taxed by the mother country without representation in Parliament, was not in the nature of a special discrimination by the British Government against their transatlantic subjects, inasmuch as historical investigations have since shown that at the same time not more than one-tenth of the people of England had any vote for, or personal representation in, the British Parliament.

A second cause which has been most influential for prejudice against England was the policy of the administration of the British Government under Lord Palmerston toward the United States during the period of the civil war. But there is now no question that the masses of the people of England were not in sympathy with their Government in this respect, and that the British working people especially, although brought in large numbers to the verge of starvation, by reason of the inability of their employers to obtain their accustomed supply of cotton from the United States, followed without murmuring the advice of those earnest and constant friends of the Federal Union—Messrs. Cobden and Bright—rather than that of Palmerston and his Ministry. And in illustration of what were the real sentiments of the masses of the United Kingdom during the period when the outlook for the loyal states was most inauspicious, it is well to recall that when Mr. Roebuck, as the representative of Lord Palmerston, advocated and moved in the House of Commons the recognition of the Southern Confederacy, and backed his recommendation with an acknowledged burst of oratory, in which he said that his only fear of the pending issue of the war was that the

South should establish its independence without England's assistance, the House, under the lead and influence of John Bright, discredited Mr. Roebuck and his arguments by such a majority as rendered the adoption of his motion an impossibility. It is now well known that it was mainly through the influence or intervention of England's Queen that war did not follow, when Admiral Wilkes, in contravention of all international law, seized the "Trent," a British steamer, with Messrs. Slidell and Mason, and in the event of which the perpetuation of the Federal Union would have been all but impossible ; a result which the government of every continental state of Europe, with the possible exception of Russia, would have been glad to have happened ; while the action of the Government of France, under Louis Napoleon, stopped little short of actual hostilities against the Union, and probably would have been more offensive but for the restraining influence of England. It should also not be forgotten that after the war Great Britain submitted our claim of damages as a nation against her to arbitration, and paid without grumbling fifteen millions of dollars in cash into the United States Treasury, a sum which, in the opinion of the arbitrators, covered all the legitimate claims of the United States against her.

With this brief consideration of the causes of prejudice on the part of the people of the United States against England, which, although powerfully operative in the past, ought not now to be, inasmuch as all the international differences involved have been amicably settled, undeniably to the advantage of the former, and are now only important as matters of history, we come now to the consideration of a third cause, which at present is far more potential than the aggregate influence of all other causes, and which is accepted and endorsed as in the nature of a rightful international grievance by nearly every member of our national or state legislatures, and by nearly every newspaper and magazine in the country. And that is the assumption that the governmental and commercial policy of England is characterized by no other principle save to monopolize, through arbitrary, selfish, and unjust measures, everything on the earth's surface that can glorify herself and promote the interests of her own insular population, to the detriment of all other nations and people ; and that it is the bounden duty of the people and government of the United States, in behalf of popular liberty, civilization, and of Christianity,

to put an end to the further continuance of such a policy, even if a resort to war would be necessary to effect it.

Thus in a recent speech in the Senate of the United States, Senator Cullom, of Illinois, characterized England as having planted its flag "on all the scattering islands and on nearly every spot on earth where it could monopolize, or control, the strategic advantages of location for its own interests"; and that we cannot "look with indifference" upon her policy to reach out farther until, if left alone, she will finally dominate Venezuela. And another member of Congress, not to be outdone in this line, publicly expressed the opinion that it was for the interest of the United States to put an end to what he termed the "grab-all policy of England."

The following additional citations of opinions recently expressed by influential men in the United States are also pertinent to this subject.

In an address at a Loyal Legion banquet, at Detroit in May, 1896, Hon. D. M. Dickinson, ex-Postmaster-General, spoke as follows :

"In the present condition, we may indulge in a reciprocity of polite phrasing and post-prandial exuberance, if our alert watchman will meantime keep an eye on our good friends across the Atlantic, especially when, having appropriated Africa, the islands and even the rocks of the sea, and wherever else force or intrigue may gain a footing, they begin to take an interest, not altogether born of curiosity or of a purely Christianizing spirit, in this hemisphere. One cannot be so innocent as to believe that the sentiment of relationship or friendship of England to the United States would stand in the way of the settled policy of Great Britain to make Englishmen richer and her power greater, even at our cost. Her unvarying policy is first and last and always, to advance British interests and retain British supremacy—to retain and add to British wealth. Her purposes are material. Whoever gets in the way of that is the enemy of England, and will be so treated—whether it be the United States as a great commercial rival who may be intrigued against and encroached upon and even crippled in some time of her distress, or when off guard, or by a tribe of black men in Africa in the way of her colonization schemes, who may be safely massacred with machine guns."

"The gold monometallic policy of Great Britain, now in force among all great civilized nations, is, I believe, the great enemy of good business throughout the world at this moment. Therefore, it seems to me, if there is any way in which we can strike England's trade or her moneyed interest, it is our clear policy to do it in the interest of silver."—*Speech of Henry Cabot Lodge in the U. S. Senate, April 6, 1895.*

"The English people are a very good people, but they are not the British Government. That is another thing; and in every emergency with which

the United States has been confronted the British Government has been our enemy. She is pushing us on every side now. She is trying to straddle the Nicaraguan canal and to grab the Alaskan goldfields. Whenever she gets hold of a bit of land, from that time her boundary line is afloat. Look at the map of India, and stop and think. That began with a trading company, English—and British arms and a British warship to help it to its rights. And now India is all a British possession. That is the kind of a nation that we are facing. Look at their fancy drill the other day, when in five days a powerful squadron was gathered at the stated point. Is there no object lesson for America in that? I tell you that we must be ready to fight. Either we will float a dead whale on the ocean, or we must say to Great Britain, ‘Here is where you stop!’”—*Speech of Hon. Joseph Hawley, U. S. Senate; Hamilton Almuni Banquet, N. Y., February, 1896.*

“He” (the British lion) “is a prowler in search of prey which is land—land anywhere, everywhere—land to convert the present boast of possessing one-third of the earth’s surface into one of holding one-half, and then two-thirds—land, more land, to extend the tribute to be paid the British crown indefinitely.”—*Correspondent of the Springfield Republican.*

“There is no power on the face of the earth that we need fear trouble with except England.”—*President Capen, Tufts College.*

Such then are typical examples of the counts in the international indictment which popular sentiment in the United States now prefers against England: and which leading legislators and influential newspapers assume and assert to be correct. But are they correct? Are they warranted by evidence? The only possible honest answer, having any regard for truth is, that they are not correct; that they do not contain one element that should commend them to the acceptance and belief of honest and intelligent men; not one count, which if tried before an honest and competent tribunal, would ‘not by them’ (to employ a legal phrase) be promptly “quashed.”

In elucidation of this subject, and for determination of the correctness of the above assertions, consideration is first asked to what might fairly be regarded as almost a test case. Thus the leading prejudicial charge preferred against England is, that her governmental and commercial policy and action, is always dominated by a desire to create for herself something in the nature of monopolies; which shall insure to her exclusive advantage; and from participation in which foreign nations shall to the greatest extent possible, be excluded. Accepting now the universal dictionary definition of “monopoly” in the above sense, namely,

“to engross or obtain by any means the exclusive right of trading in any place, and the sole power of vending any commodity or goods in a particular place or country” (Webster); “a right of exclusive sale—an exclusive privilege to carry on a traffic” (Century),

the writer would respectfully request Messrs. Cullom, Dickinson, Hawley, Lodge, or any other person who agrees with them in sentiment, to specify some one thing in respect to which England enjoys and maintains a monopoly, excepting, of course, the monopoly of sovereignty, in default of which there can be no certain government, or that which is created and exists when a government assumes exclusive control of the production and sale of any article for the purpose of revenue; as when the United States will not permit a gallon of distilled spirits to be removed from the place of its production, or from a bonded warehouse, for use or consumption, without the previous payment of a tax.

A popular and ready answer would probably be "land." But there is not a square foot of the earth's surface over which the flag of England floats which the citizen of the United States, in common with the people of all other countries, has not a right to enter upon and possess and control and enjoy on terms as favorable as are ever granted to any Englishman. The only possible exception to this statement is that England, in common with all colonizing nations that establish governments over lands obtained from barbarous people, often finds it necessary to exercise some restraint over the first occupants of such territory, in order that the desired progress in respect to civilization may not be retarded, and possibly defeated.

A most striking and instructive exemplification of the sovereignty of England in this respect, is found in the recent history of South Africa. Twenty years ago, when the safety of Europeans in South Africa was menaced by a general revolt of the dark skinned races, England assumed the government of the "Transvaal," or South African Republic, a name since given to a large section of country, northeast of Cape Colony; no other government coveting the task or expense of so doing. To provide for the common safety of the various people, who allured by the diamond fields and other inducements were flocking in to it, some rules of government became necessary. And, accordingly, at a so called "Pretorian" convention of South African representatives, assembled in 1881, a code of rules or laws drafted and presented by the British Colonial Office in London, was adopted, and of which the rule XIV. reads as follows: "All persons other than natives (who were then typical savages) conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic (*a*) will have

full liberty, with their families, to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the South African Republic ; (b) they will be entitled to hire or possess houses, shops, and premises ; (c) they may carry on their commerce either in person or by any agents they may think fit to employ ; (d) they will not be subject in respect of their persons or property, or in respect of their commerce or industry, to any taxes, whether general or local, other than those which are or may be imposed upon citizens of the said Republic.”

But how, it may be asked about trade ? Does not England extend privileges to her own subjects, and impose discriminations against the people of the other nations and countries in respect to trade and commerce ? And here again we are obligated to return a similar answer : namely, that England grants no privileges to her own people in respect to trade and commerce which are not equally accorded to the people of all other countries ; and that there is no country over which the sovereignty of England extends, where the people of all other countries—white, black, yellow and red—have not the right or privilege of trade, in its broadest sense of exporting and importing, buying, selling, or transporting, on terms in any way different from those enjoyed by her immediate and typical subjects.

A brief word here to avoid misapprehension, and in further illustration of the extraordinarily liberal policy of the British (home) government. The sovereignty of England is said to cover about one-third of the earth’s surface. It includes forty separate so-called colonies, which embrace about one-fourth of the population of the globe. Whenever the population of any of these colonies becomes considerable, and there is a manifest and intelligent desire on the part of its inhabitants to be emancipated from close dependence on the mother-country, England grants them a substantially free and independent government. A clear and interesting illustration of this is afforded in the case of Canada, which has a population of about 5,000,000. England appoints a Governor, whose duties are mainly ceremonial and nominal. The people of Canada elect their own legislators, their ministers, or state administrators ; and the concurrence of the Crown is not required in the appointment of any public officer below the Governor. Under a government thus organized, Canada makes its own laws ; imposes and collects its own taxes and determines their expenditure ; maintains its own military forces ; establishes

its own banking and currency system, and its own educational, sanitary and police provisions. One of the few restraining conditions on the complete independence of Canada and the other self-governing colonies of the British empire, is that they are not allowed to treat at first hand with foreign governments; for the evident reason that the smallest as well as the largest of the British possessions, may otherwise involve the Empire in more or less difficult and critical negotiations with foreign powers. The self-governing colonies are not, however, compelled to accept the settlement of any difficulty they may have with a foreign government, which may be recommended to them by their home government; and this has been referred to as the link at which the mooring chains of the larger British colonies to the mother country are most likely (if ever) to snap. As a rule the Home Government is reluctant to intervene in the affairs of her self-governing colonies, without special invitation, except in respect to the selection and control of strategical positions regarded as important for the defence of the Empire. One, and one only (interesting), exception to the rule, that the British colonies shall not treat directly with foreign powers, has been made, and that in the case of Canada; which unquestionably in view of her possible reciprocal trade relations with the United States, is allowed to negotiate directly with the foreign nations in respect to her commercial tariff. Canada, as well as other of the British colonies, having adopted the "protective" policy, accordingly imposes duties on her imports which in some instances are very high, and almost prohibitive. But whatever may be the tariff rates established by Canada, or by any of the other British colonies, they are uniform as respects the imports of all nations; and no discriminating rates would be sanctioned by the Imperial Government in any colonial tariff rates unless to meet an equivalent discrimination. The fact also that the tariff rates of Canada are regarded by the mercantile community of England as prejudicial to their interests, and have long been a subject of complaint, has never induced the Home Government to take action on the subject. Another illustration to the same effect is to be found in the fact that, when the Council of India (the immediate governing power of that country) partly for the purpose of revenue, and partly at the demand of Indian manu-

facturers for protection, imposed a custom tax on the importation of cotton fabrics into India, the manufacturers of England united in opposition to such an extent that it constituted an important element in the recent election that resulted in the displacement of the Liberal (Rosebery) administration; and yet the Indian duties on the importation of British cotton fabrics have not as yet been abrogated.

The allegation that the British Government exacts tributes of its subjects, has not even so much as a shadow of a foundation. England does not take from any of her citizens or subjects as much as a sixpence which can merit the name of tribute. She expects that such of her colonies as have sought and been accorded the right of self-government will, in the main, defray the expenses of such government. And this they do by such methods of taxation as legislators chosen by them shall determine ; subject only to the limitation that the taxes imposed shall be uniform on all persons and on all subjects of trade or commerce. Thus the comparatively small Island of Jamaica, with a population in 1891 of 639,431, of which more than two-thirds are negroes, has a legislative assembly, and by its enactment collects a considerable revenue from export duties on rum. But if an Englishman desires to export this commodity from Jamaica he cannot do it under any more favorable terms than are accorded to a citizen of the United States, or of any other country. Even the very small group of West India Islands known as the "Caymans," with a population of less than five thousand, have their own legislative council, and enact their own laws.

In all of the thirty-one colonies of England which are not self-governing, and in which the Crown has an effective control of legislation, and also over the public officers, special attention is given to popular education ; and schools have been established, which as a rule are free and non-sectarian, and are liberally aided by government grants ; and attendance upon which is often compulsory. Thus in the island of Jamaica there were in 1892 nearly 900 government schools, besides many private schools. In South Africa—Cape Colony—the British Government makes large annual grants in aid of education in every stage. The number of assisted schools is about one thousand, and in aid of them the government grants about an equal sum with that raised by free and voluntary effort. Industrial training is also specially provided for boys and

girls of the aboriginal population, of whom about fifty thousand at present are reported as attending school. Even in the much criticised little colony of Honduras, in Central America, with a population of less than 30,000, and the only one of the Central American States south of Mexico that does not habitually revolutionize, the government aids in the keeping up of denominational schools, as none other probably would be countenanced by the people; but subjects them to regular and close inspection. In fact England leads the way in her efforts, independent of creed or sex, to educate the world's population, and probably accomplishes more in this direction than all the rest of the civilized and christianized nations.

A half century ago England at the cost of \$100,000,000, and without shedding a drop of blood, abolished slavery; and to-day, wherever the British flag floats in sovereignty no man can, under any circumstances, hold any other man as a slave. A quarter of a century later the United States effected the same result at a cost of several hundred thousand lives, and over nine thousand millions of money, or property.

A reflection is made on England for massacring tribes of black men in Africa with machine guns. But machine guns could never be used for a better purpose than to put a stop at once and forever, as England has done wherever she has sovereignty, to the ancient and horrible savagery of human sacrifices and cannibalism. And when England has once put down savagery, that rendered civilization impossible, her treatment of the subjugated and uncivilized has always been merciful. The conquered Kaffir, or Zulu of South Africa, has become under English rule a freeman; endowed for the first time with an absolute title to land, and other property the results of his own labor; and if injustice is done him, the English courts are open to him for redress and protection as speedily and impartially as to any white man.

The British American colonies have never warred with their Indians; never robbed them of their land, but have always dealt kindly and justly by them. A current proverb in the United States, that the only good Indian is a dead Indian, finds no favor in Canada. England, moreover, is the only nation that has ever established a hospital exclusively for the care of sick or suffering North American Indians. On the other hand, the treatment of

their Indians by the United States has always been notoriously arbitrary and bad. It has sequestered their land ; arbitrarily abrogated its treaties with them; almost continually provoked them to hostilities, and nearly effected their extermination.

Senator Hawley extends an invitation to the people of the United States to "look at the map of India, and stop and think," for the purpose of understanding "the kind of nation that we are facing": "for now India is all a British possession." This is most excellent advice. Let us accept it. Before England acquired control of India the mass of her great population was almost as low down in the scale of civilization as it was possible to conceive. From the time of Alexander the Great, and probably for unnumbered centuries before, the experience of the country had been one of constant war and disorder, contingent in great part on foreign invasions, and in part on the bitter antagonism of domestic religious creeds and diversity of races. The Indian ryot (peasant) was practically a slave with no acknowledged right to the products of his labor ; and when any one, of either high or low degree, acquired anything in the way of money-wealth, it was almost the universal practice to speedily secrete it under ground, to prevent its arbitrary plunder on the part of rulers. So that the amount of buried treasure, even to this day, in India, is regarded as almost fabulous. There can be no denial that England acquired control of India in the first instance by conquest and arbitrary methods. But in this respect she acted in accordance with the then accepted policy of all other nations; and as at the time when England mainly acquired possession of India the United States did not exist, and her people were a part of England, and as they did not protest, it is difficult to see how they can now animadvert on the action of England without passing censure on themselves. It is also well to recall that England never did a meaner thing in respect to the acquisition of territory than did the United States in 1848, when, under a claim of might and a higher civilization, she robbed, without justification, and at "one fell swoop," poor Mexico of more than one half of all its territory.

The point of interest in respect to England's connection with India is not what she did a hundred years and more ago, but what she has done within a comparatively recent period, and what she is doing now. Her work of ameliorating the condition

of her Indian subjects virtually commenced in 1843, when slavery was abolished in all her East Indian possessions, and 12,000,000 people were at once made free. To-day the humblest Indian peasant is secure in the possession and control of his property, and if wronged in any way can appeal to and find protection in the courts which England has established. As one result of this policy the buried treasures of India are beginning to come forth and seek investment in England's interest-bearing securities. Under native and Mogul rulers, the only compulsory contribution from the Indian people, worthy of the name of a tax, was an assessment on land, which averaged about 12 shillings per acre. To-day the land tax of India, which the government has been obliged to maintain for general revenue purposes, does not average more than 2 shillings per acre. Before England assumed dominion in India, the system of exaction of her native rulers was so perfected that they were assured of the very last penny that could be taken from the farmers and cattle raisers without stripping them of everything ; leaving to the tenant class little other than the privilege of living. To-day the existing system of taxation in India, is conceded to be, at least, eminently just. Men of native races constitute a part of the highest Indian judiciary ; and by an act affirmed by the Imperial Government it has been ordained "that no native of the territories of India, or any natural born subject of Great Britain resident therein, shall by reason of his religion, birth, descent, color, or any one of them, be disabled from any place, office, or employment under its government." Under native rule the population of India was kept down by war and local feuds to a great extent ; but under the British rule of peace it has increased to a degree so disproportionate to existing agricultural resources, that famines are often contingent on the deficiency of crops through natural influences. To meet such a lamentable condition of affairs the British Government has reserved from its annual revenues, and so created, a large "famine fund," which is solely applicable to relieving popular distress occasioned by a scarcity of food. Has anything like this ever been done by any other civilized and Christianized Government ? In fact, it is not too much to say that the present population of India would not have found food under any previous government of that country ; and that its very existence has been made possible only through the

conditions of food production and distribution established by England's government.

Popular education in India is systematically promoted by England; and the number of schools supported or aided by public funds, and controlled by departments of education in every province, is now upwards of 150,000; rising from elementary village schools to high schools and colleges.

Since the Indian mutiny in 1857 the government has expended a large amount—at present many millions per annum—on works of public utility for the purpose of increasing and cheapening (through roads, canals, and railroads) the means of transportation, for promoting irrigation, and especially for favoring the use of new tools and new methods for cultivating the soil. The result of this policy has been greatly to increase the annual food product of the country and the opportunities for the industrial employment of its people. Thus in 1880 India exported less than 500,000 bushels of wheat, but at the present time her annual export is not less than 30,000,000 bushels.

One blessing which the British occupation of India has given the world should not be overlooked. Formerly all cinchona-bark, from which quinine is manufactured, came from the forests of the northwestern states of South America; and as the cinchona trees were not under any system of cultivation, and as the methods of collecting their bark were destructive of the tree, it was easy to see that, under a continually increasing demand, this most important natural product would soon be exhausted. Moved by such considerations the government of England determined to make the attempt to cultivate the cinchona tree in India, and, calling in the aid of the best botanists, finally succeeded in so doing, although a previous like effort on the part of the Dutch government had failed in Java. The result has been that the supply of quinine is now practically inexhaustible; and in place of being formerly worth its weight in gold, its price is now brought within the means of the poorest people, who most need it. How British Indian quinine has become an instrumentality of war, as well as of peace, is shown by the fact that the French in Madagascar, and the Spaniards in Cuba, have recently deemed an adequate supply of it as essential as that of shot or shell.

In short there is no government in the world whose administration is more honestly conducted, and which is doing more for

the material good of the governed, than the present English government of India. And the secret of England's success in ruling the vast congeries of people known as India, a fifth of the population of the globe—288,000,000 in 1891—made up of different races and religions, and with eighty different languages, lies mainly in the fact that in no country, except America and Great Britain and her colonies, is the individual so little interfered with by the government. No kind of pressure is put upon the Indian to be anything but what he pleases. He is exempt from military conscription. He may profess what religion he likes ; express any opinion ; enjoy the right of public meeting, and can criticise the government freely without fear of consequences. And the attitude of the government towards its subjects in later years has been always one of help and encouragement.

Another even more instructive illustration of the treatment and policy of the government of England in respect to her subjects or dependents, is to be found in the recent experience of Egypt. Previous to the English protectorate, consequent upon the suppression of the rebellion under Arabi-Pasha in 1882, the condition of the country was wretched almost beyond conception. Its revenue system, in accordance with Asiatic ideas, comprehended nearly every form of iniquitous extortion. Under the rule of Ismail-Pasha (the Khedive who built the Suez Canal with the enforced and unpaid labor of his subjects), the acknowledged revenue annually collected from less than 5,000,000 population was about £16,000,000 (\$80,000,000); while apart from this sum, the amount that was wrung from the miserable peasantry, which never found its way into any official ledger, was also very considerable. The first thing an English finance committee of experts effected, was to reduce the annual taxation of \$80,000,000 to \$50,000,000, which, apart from money terms, included a sum total of vexatious and petty exactions that cannot well be expressed in figures. The results of a continuance of this policy by England has been almost without precedent in the world's fiscal history. At no previous period since Egypt began to have a name has the fellah lived under a government so careful to protect his rights. For the first time he is allowed to control the fruits of his labor. To-day under England's rule he knows exactly the amount of taxes he has to pay, and when he has to pay them ;

and that when he has once paid the legal amount, no official, big or small, has a right to extort from him one single piastre beyond it. He knows, too, that he cannot at any moment be seized and dragged off as formerly, to perhaps some different part of the country, to work under constant dread of the whip, at any task suggested by the caprice of the Khedive, or of some powerful Pasha. Under such circumstances Egypt has never, certainly not within a recent period, enjoyed so large a measure of prosperity. Notwithstanding the recent universal decline in price of agricultural staples, the Egyptian products and exports of cotton, sugar, tobacco, wheat, etc., have rapidly increased ; the annual value of its cotton crop having risen, even under falling prices, from \$37,000,000 in 1888 to \$48,000,000 in 1894. When England first occupied the country the four per cent. Egyptian debt securities were quoted at about 50. To-day their quotation is over 100, and their European holders have been willing to reduce their rate of interest by nearly one-half.

Fifty years ago the accusations now preferred by Messrs. Cul-lom, Dickinson, Hawley, Lodge, Chandler, Capen, and others, against England for greed, "grab-all" and "monopoly" policies, had undoubtedly some foundation. At that time the whole commercial policy of England, and of all other countries claiming to be in any degree civilized, was based on the theory that commerce could benefit one country only to the extent that it injured another ; and that it was the part of wisdom always to secure a favorable balance of trade by selling as much and buying as little as possible, and receiving pay for what was sold, not in other useful products, but in gold. And this is the theory that to-day characterizes the commerce and trade policy of all nations—especially the United States—except England. Forty odd years ago England came to the conclusion that her supremacy over the earth could best be attained by supremacy in trade rather than by the supremacy of the sword, and that the exclusive trade of any colony or people that has to be fought for costs more than it is all worth. And between 1845 and 1856 she inaugurated this latter policy by substantially removing all restrictions on the trade and commerce of her own immediate people, *i. e.*, of the United Kingdom. And, what is generally overlooked, she gave also to the three hundred millions of other people over which her sovereignty extends the privilege of ac-

cording or refusing reciprocal action. In this respect England stands alone. No other nation that has ever existed, or now exists, has ever adopted a similar policy. The following illustrations exemplify it.

India has been made the subject of reference. But England does not control all of India. The Portuguese, who were the pioneers in Eastern conquest, still retain a dominion over about 1,500 square miles on the west coast of Hindostan, and its native inhabitants are now in revolt. Portugal has sent a military force from Europe to suppress it, and its Governor in command has made proclamation to the rebels that, unless they lay down their arms, means will be taken for their extermination, that villages will be burnt or destroyed in succession, and all in arms will be liable to be shot. The people of British India are at peace ; and, if the Portuguese rebels are successful, they will probably like nothing better than to come under the sovereignty of England. Since the great rebellion in 1857, the military forces of England in India have not been employed except to compel the barbarous people on her frontiers—the Afghans and the Chirals—to keep the peace. And the cause of this famous mutiny is now well known to have been due mainly to an assumption on the part of the Sepoys, not that they were politically oppressed, but that they were obliged to grease their cartridges with the fat of the accursed swine.

It is alleged that if the United States does not speedily annex the Hawaiian Islands, England or some other European power will grab them. Let us see what certainly would happen if the United States, or any of the great European powers, except England, should grab. The first thing that they would do would be to draw a line about the islands, restricting to a great degree all commercial intercourse between them and other nations. If the policy advocated by Mr. McKinley were to prevail, the restriction on the part of the United States, would amount almost to prohibition. If France were to grab them, her commercial regulations would probably be patterned after the provisions for conquered Madagascar, which make that great island an almost exclusive French province, and absolutely prohibit the importation of great staple articles from any other country than France and her colonies. The recent imposition by France of adverse and discriminating duties on shoes imported from the United States

would also probably be made operative in Hawaii. If Russia should obtain possession of these islands, and establish her home policy over them, none other than a Russian could obtain a free-hold title to any land. No importations would be allowed that Russian producers would like to supply ; no language would be officially tolerated except Russian, and no religion except that of the Greek Church. The government would be in the highest degree despotic. If Spain grabbed we know what her policy would be from the experience of Cuba. On the other hand, if the island should pass under the sovereignty of England, restrictions on trade and commerce, foreign and domestic, would be reduced to a minimum; popular government, in which all nationalities would participate, would be established, with English common law as its basis ; the rights of the natives, as well as of all other citizens, would be guarded ; and, above all, a national sanitary system, copied from that of India, the best in the world, and admirably adapted to the fifteen different races which recent anthropological investigations have shown are now being propagated in the islands, would be speedily introduced.

The bearing also of the commercial policy of England upon the Venezuelan question, which thus far has hardly attracted the attention of the people of the United States, is really the only involved point that materially affects their interest, and as such is more worthy of their serious consideration than any other. As is well known, there have been repeated attempts to settle the difficulties between England and Venezuela by arbitration, and that all of them have thus far resulted in failure. For what reason ? Obviously not from disagreement about the partition of sovereignty over a tract of tropical wilderness, which no white man would ever care to permanently live in, and which there is no probability that Venezuela with its sparse and mongrel population would ever attempt to colonize, or properly and peacefully govern. Apart from certain minor considerations, the real reason of disagreement has been, that England wants free navigation of the Orinoco, and Venezuela does not. This is acknowledged to have been the main reason why the last attempt of England under the recent administration of Lord Rosebery failed. But any doubt on this point ought to be at once removed by reference to an official letter, which, singularly, hitherto has almost escaped popular attention, addressed under date

of February 17, 1890, by Señor Paraza, then Venezuelan Minister at Washington, to Mr. Blaine, the then United States Secretary of State, in which he says : *If Great Britain is allowed to control the Orinoco "her vessels would enter the mouth of that river, and would carry to the great centres of population her production, her ideas and her exclusive interest ;"* and to prevent such a result, which according to Señor Paraza, "would render nugatory the efforts that are now being made by the nations of America to draw closer their family bonds and have one and the same destiny," he begs Mr. Blaine to request Great Britain to settle her differences with Venezuela.

That in case of the control of the Orinoco by Great Britain her vessels would enter the mouth of that river, and carry her productions, her ideas and her interests, cannot be doubted. But Great Britain has never sought any exclusive control of the Orinoco. She has only sought to have it made free to the commerce of all nations ; and if she were to obtain control, she would not claim or exercise any exclusive privileges over that river, any more than she claims and exercises exclusive privileges over the St. Lawrence, the Nile, the Ganges, the Indus or the Irrawaddy, all of which she territorially controls.

On the other hand, the letter of Señor Paraza warrants the assumption that Venezuela does not want the Orinoco to be free, but exclusive to herself, for the purpose of gain through some form of money exaction on the commerce that desires to use it, and with the expectation that this privilege of exclusive control will at no distant day be accorded to her, mainly through the agency of the United States. She has already chartered a purely speculative company looking to a monopoly of the river and its adjacent territory, of which the President of Venezuela is reported as one of the largest stockholders.

The real and only issue of importance in this problem of Venezuela to the people of the United States is, will they unite with the British Government in securing to all nations the perpetual right to the free commercial use of this mighty river, which constitutes the only available access to the great northern interior of South America; or allow its control to pass to a government which is one of the most unstable of all countries; whose commerce is little more than barter; which has no banking system, and whose history is one monotonous record of

revolutions accomplished through bloodshed, and a remarkable ferocity on the part of all antagonizing political parties? Peace and safety to the citizens of the United States is certainly not likely to be assured by any such action on the part of their government. It is the old contest again between barbarism and civilization; with a marked tendency on the part of the United States to favor barbarism, with its most certain concomitant of war.

In conclusion the general result of England's governmental and commercial policy may be thus fairly and comprehensively stated.

Wherever her sovereignty has gone, two blades of grass have grown where one grew before. Her flag wherever it has been advanced has benefited the country over which it floats; and has carried with it civilization, the Christian religion, order, justice and prosperity. England has always treated a conquered race with justice, and what under her rule is the law for the white man is the law for his black, red and yellow brother. And here we have one explanation of the fact that England alone of the nations has been successful in establishing and maintaining colonies: and of the further extraordinary fact that a comparatively small insular country, containing less than 40,000,000 inhabitants, can successfully preside over the destinies of about 360,000,000 other members of the human race. England would never have told a neighboring country, desiring reciprocal trade relations, as the United States told Mexico, in 1866, through its House of Representatives, "that to speak of permanent desirable commercial relations" with her "is without hope of success, or promise of substantial results."

What an endorsement of the honesty of England and its people is involved in the reported and probable fact, that the Church of Rome makes that non-Catholic country and its much abused bankers, its fiduciary guardian of the fiscal resources necessary for the maintenance of its vast missionary enterprises and other religious objects, and which experience has shown cannot be intrusted with an equal degree of confidence to any other country. And a similar action and belief on the part of other foreign purse-holders, accounts undoubtedly in a large degree for the low rate of interest on money capital in England (British $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Consols, rising to 110 in

February last), and the unvarying great demand for her national securities.

But some may here ask : How about the wrongs and abuses of Ireland and her people on the part of England. The answer is that they originated in an old-time theory, once accepted and practised by all nations, that might makes right, and that differences in religious belief warrant persecution and a debarment from all participation in government. And it is this policy that has entailed a condition of affairs in Ireland that has not been easy to remedy. But England now leads the way among the nations in the utter repudiation of this policy, and the day cannot be far distant when the grievances of Ireland will be amicably and satisfactorily settled by her. And that real progress in this direction has been attained is proved by the fact that no subject of England in Ireland, or any other country under her sovereignty, is now debarred from participating in her government by reason of his religious belief, which is more than can be affirmed of the condition of affairs in some other countries claiming to be free, christianized, and civilized.

If the Englishman is unbending and determined to have his way, such characteristics are due to the Anglo-Saxon element in him ; and this as participated in by the people of the United States has been the main cause of their development and prosperity as a nation.

The reason why England is hated by other nations is because she is feared, and she is feared mainly by reason of the success of her commercial policy, which has brought her not only wealth, but strength. She is envied, too, by unsuccessful rivals in common industrial fields. But the United States as a nation is hated and distrusted in an equal degree. There is not a government on the American continent, except Canada and Venezuela, that does not both fear and hate her ; and if the United States decides in favor of the free navigation of the Orinoco the latter will speedily be accounted among her most bitter enemies. All countries save England, and possibly Russia and Japan, would rejoice at the dissolution of the Federal Union.

The United States now stands at the parting of the ways. Shall she by antagonism with England bring about for herself a national isolation, with the inevitable result of dwarfing the intellectual and industrial energies of her people ; or by strength-

ening the bonds of peace and friendship with England, unite the two foremost and most progressive nations of the world for the joint attainment of those results that constitute national greatness? If it were certain, as it probably is, that England will continue her present commercial policy, it would be for the true interests of the United States that England should further extend her sovereignty over the surface of the earth ; for then the people of the United States would have the privilege of unrestricted trade with all the land and all subjects of England without the expense of governing them.

Some years since in a social conversation with one of the ablest men that England ever sent to represent her diplomatically at Washington, the question was put to him : "Do you think that war between the United States and England is ever again likely to occur?" The answer was promptly : "Considering the many ties and common interests that unite the two nations, such an occurrence does not seem possible." Then, hesitating for a moment, he continued : "But when I consider the resources, energy and skill of your people, the thought sometimes occurs to me, that if the United States were to adopt the commercial policy of England she might so crowd us out of the markets of the world, on which my countrymen so largely depend for industrial employment and support, that England might have to fight for her existence."

If, now, this adventitious supposition on the part of this wise English diplomat is warranted, it would seem to be wisdom on the part of such of the people of the United States as hate England and desire to humiliate her, to adopt as soon as possible her commercial policy.

DAVID A. WELLS.